

Matt Pagel
655 Hampshire Street
San Francisco CA 94110

Aug 31st 2018

Via ECFS
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to
47 U.S.C. Section 160(c); WC Docket No. 18-141; Category 1**

Dear FCC,

I'm writing to ask that you not take actions that will prevent local providers from being able to provide internet at competitive rates. In my town, we are finally to a point where there is true competition for internet providers, and this competition has made noticeable improvements to my life.

Broadband access at my home is important to me because I often work from home and also enjoy the ability to stream video content over the internet using sites like Netflix and Hulu.

For years, even though I live in a major metropolitan area, as a renter I had only one option for high-speed internet: Comcast. Comcast knew they were the only game in town for people like me, and it allowed them to treat me the way monopoly companies tend to treat their customers: terrible customer service, non-competitive features, and extremely high prices.

An example of bad customer service due to monopoly status: At one point I moved across town and wanted to transfer my service from my old home to my new one. No changes to the package or anything. Both old and new homes were in well-established parts of town with ready access. While I managed to get the service hooked up, I was double-billed for six months. I called Comcast customer service at least twenty times. The people I spoke with were not helpful. One even insisted that the best fix to my situation would be to move back in to my old apartment. I finished every call angry, and deeply felt that Comcast didn't care one fig about me, even though I was paying exorbitant rates.

Now that the monopoly status has lessened, Comcast has made strong, clear, loud statements that they are working very hard at improving their customer service. I strongly believe this change only came about due to competition from local providers.

An example of non-competitive features due to monopoly status: Even though I live in the center of the tech revolution, I was only able to get 10 Mbps internet from Comcast. Even though faster internet was commonplace elsewhere.

Because the monopoly status has lessened, I now have three options for Gig-speed internet: Comcast, Wave, and Sonic. I strongly believe this change in Comcast's offering of Gig-speed internet to us came about due to competition from local providers. Had Wave and Sonic not been able to provide faster internet, I'm certain I'd still be stuck with 10 Mbps internet.

And example of exorbitant prices due to monopoly status: Comcast would offer intro prices, but as a customer of theirs for over 10 years, even though I'd call in to renegotiate prices every year or so. by the end of my time with them I was paying over \$250 per month, and continued to randomly increment up each month for no explained reason. For 10 Mbps internet and cable. This is more than this should cost.

Because of local competition, I've been able to get \$30/month Gig-speed internet and even Free for six months from Sonic. Sonic has treated me so well that I haven't felt the need to renegotiate the price after my free six months because the quality of service is so good and the monthly fee hasn't been incrementing up inexplicably the way Comcast's would.

If you believe in American Freedom, you shouldn't believe in allowing for-profit companies to act as monopolies. The internet semi-monopoly in America has hurt us. Other countries have much better internet than we have. In order to stay competitive with the world, we need to allow internet companies to compete, innovate, and thrive.

Matt Pagel